UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/576,814	05/16/2006	Mikael Furu	3397-143PUS	9035
	7590 09/28/2009 EN, PONTANI, LIEBERMAN & PAVANE LLP FIFTH AVENUE		EXAMINER	
551 FIFTH AVENUE			EDWARDS, LAURA ESTELLE	
SUITE 1210 NEW YORK, NY 10176			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1792	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/28/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/576,814	FURU ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Laura Edwards	1792				
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(\$) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 l	May 2009.					
,—	. · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	/ 					
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-15</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>6-9 and 13-15</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5 and 10-12</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examin	er.					
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>4/24/06</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3.⊠ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)	4) T large to 0	(DTO 442)				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
3) 🔀 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 5) 📙 Notice of Informal Patent Application						
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>20060424 and 20060824</u> . 6) Other:						

Page 2

Applicant's election of Group I, claims 1-5 including new claims 10-12 in the reply filed on 5/15/09 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Applicant should note that new claims 13-15 are withdrawn as depending from the non-elected invention (method claims 6-9).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-5 and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, line 7, it is unclear how at least one row of a plurality of nozzles can comprise only one nozzle for spraying treating agent? Clarification is necessary.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nissinen et al (WO 02/072953), hereinafter referred to as Nissinen.

Art Unit: 1792

Nissinen provides a spray coating unit for paper and board webs, comprising a application chamber including at least a row of nozzles (21) for applying a coating composition to the web and spraying members or nozzles (36) for providing mist (i.e., moist air or steam) into the chamber at the entrance of the chamber (see Fig. 3, page 14, lines 1+).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 2, 4, 5, and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nissinen et al (WO 02/072953) in view of Garrett (US 3,388,965).

The teachings of Nissinen have been mentioned above but Nissinen is silent concerning the spraying members providing mist at an average drop size of no more than 150 microns.

However, it was known in the art, at the time the invention was made, to provide for spraying members providing mist on a web at an average drop size of no more than 150 microns in order

Art Unit: 1792

to provide for subtle moistening but not saturation of the web to provide a smooth web surface as evidenced by Garrett (col. 2, lines 45-57 and col. 3, lines 4-9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide spraying members providing mist at an average drop size of no more than 150 microns as taught by Garrett in the Nissinen unit in order to subtly moisten the web yet not saturate the web to provide a smooth web surface for receipt of the coating material.

With respect to claims 4, 5, and 12, even though Nissinen does not suggest treatment including misting of both sides of the web, Garrett recognizes misting of the web on opposed sides as shown in Fig. 1. Thus, it would be within the purview of one skilled in the art in the art to provide misting spray members/nozzles on of both sides of the web in the Nissinen unit. Simultaneous treatment of both sides of the web would require less time to process the web and lower manufacturing costs.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following patent discloses the state of the art with respect to a sprayer coating system including a mister nozzle for treatment of an automobile: Inculet (US 5,156,880).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laura Edwards whose telephone number is (571) 272-1227. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Wednesday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nadine Norton can be reached on (571) 272-1465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Laura Edwards/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 1792

Le September 25, 2009